

Appl. No. 10/099,901
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2006

PATENT

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 2, 8, 12, 13, 20, and 25 have been amended. New claims 28-30 have been added. No new matter has been added to the amended or new claims.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 16, 18, 20, and 23-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lai et al. (6,593,860), hereafter Lai.

Claims 7, 8, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of Monteiro et al. (6,119,163).

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of Zhu (5,870,146).

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of Floyd et al. (7,003,584).

Interview

The undersigned thanks the Examiner and Examiner Prieto for the helpful interview conducted on June 27, 2006.

Specification

Paragraph [08] has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 12 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment obviates the rejection under §112.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claim 1 recites "a proxy transcoder server ("PTS") coupled between the source output and the destination input, wherein the PTS is adapted to perform transcoding of multimedia system protocols, the multimedia system protocols selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, and SIP" among other elements. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these elements in the manner claimed.

Appl. No. 10/099,901
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2006

PATENT

Embodiments of the present invention provide a system for transferring multimedia information from a source location to a destination location through one or more networks. The system includes a PTS, that in addition to media transcoding, "can also perform system protocol transcoding. A multimedia system protocol is typically an umbrella of protocols that define how multimedia end-points can connect to each other, can issue and interpret commands (such as streaming or opening a video channel), can tear down connections, can join conferences. A system protocol typically covers the following important aspects: call signalling, command and control, media transports aspects, and media coding aspects." (Specification at paragraph [119]).

Lai discusses a system and method for transcoding of media content from a source type to a destination type. (Abstract and FIG. 6). Referring to FIG. 6, Lai merely discusses transcoding media content (e.g., file format and bit rate) for Internet (web-based) distribution. Lai does not teach or suggest transcoding "multimedia system protocols" "selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, and SIP" as recited by claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 9, 14, 16, and 18, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 1, as well as for the additional elements they recite.

Claim 20 recites "a source output coupled to a first network and adapted to provide a first stream of information, wherein the source output is adapted to support a first protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, RTSP, and SIP; a destination input coupled to a second network and receiving a second stream of information, wherein the destination input is adapted to support a second protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, and SIP" and "a proxy transcoder server ("PTS") coupled between the source output and the destination input" among other elements. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these elements in the manner claimed.

As discussed in relation to claim 1, Lai does not teach or suggest a proxy transcoder server, a destination input adapted to support a second protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, and SIP, and a source output adapted to support a first

Appl. No. 10/099,901
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2006

PATENT

protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, RTSP, and SIP. On the contrary, Lai merely discusses transcoding media content for web-based distribution. For at least these reasons, claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 23, which depends from claim 20, is in condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 20, as well as for the additional elements it recites.

Claim 24 recites "selecting a transcoding process from a plurality of transcoding processes in a library based upon the identified source capability and the identified destination capability, wherein the transcoding process is adapted to transcode from a first protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, RTSP, and SIP to a second protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, and SIP" among other elements. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference does not teach or suggest at least these elements in the manner claimed.

As discussed in relation to claims 1 and 20, Lai does not teach or suggest a transcoding process that is adapted to transcode from a first protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, RTSP, and SIP to a second protocol selected from the group consisting of H.320, H.323, H.324, and SIP. For at least these reasons, claim 24 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 25-27, which depend from claim 24, are in condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claim 24, as well as for the additional elements they recite.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 8, 15, and 17, which depend from claim 1 and claims 21-22, which depend from claim 20, are in condition for allowance, for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claims 1 and 20, respectively, as well as for the additional elements they recite. Moreover, the cited references, either taken alone or in combination, do not make up for the deficiencies in Lai. For at least these reasons, claims 7, 8, 15, 17, and 21-22 are in condition for allowance.

Appl. No. 10/099,901
Amdt. dated August 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of May 4, 2006


PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


Craig C. Largent
Reg. No. 56,400

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
CCL/ka
60796354 v1